

Docket No.: 1163-0515PUS1  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

In re Patent Application of:  
Tsutomu MATSUBARA et al.

Allowed: June 29, 2009

Application No.: 10/506,890

Confirmation No.: 6698

Filed: September 7, 2004

Art Unit: 2626

For: VEHICLE MOUNTED CONTROL  
APPARATUS

---

Examiner: H. X. Vo

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS  
FOR ALLOWANCE UNDER 37 CFR §1.104(E)**

MS Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Madam:

Applicants have received the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance issued on June 29, 2009 in connection with the above-identified application. In response, Applicants offer the following comments.

**COMMENTS**


The Examiner, in the Reasons for Allowance, offers a generic statement as to why the claims of the present invention are allowable over the prior art of record. Although Applicants agree that the prior art does not disclose or teach the features listed by the Examiner, Applicants wish to emphasize that it is the claims as a whole, including the various interrelationships and interconnections between the various claimed elements, which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Further, Applicants submit that each claim should be considered separately as a whole as being allowable over the prior art of record.

For instance, the Examiner has offered the same reasons for allowance for independent 9, 11, and 21, citing specifically to the language found in claim 11. However, Applicants note that there are differences in the particular language recited in claims 9, 11, and 21, which may or may not give rise to different interpretations. For example, claims 9 and 21 do not specifically recite a "storage section," nor do they recite displaying the visual notice by "changing a screen of the display device to exhibit the read display format." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each claim should be interpreted based on its specific language and other appropriate parameters, and additional limitations should not be imputed to any of the claims based on the Reasons for Allowance.

In conclusion, Applicants emphasize that each claim should be considered separately as a whole, taking into consideration the various interrelationships and interconnections between the various claim elements, and should be interpreted on its specific claim language and other appropriate parameters.

Dated: August 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  #47,305  
for D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40,439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant